

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/509,880		Applicant(s) SCHROTT ET AL.	
	Examiner Mr. Terry K. Cecil		Art Unit 1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mr. Terry K. Cecil. (3) _____
 (2) William Breneman. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 September 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Clack (U.S. 5,290,442); Punako et al. (U.S. 4,632,482); and Ackland et al. (U.S. 4,653,337).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Mr. Terry K. Cecil/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1797

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Clack was shown to teach pin electrodes that pass through an elastomeric wall of a manifold and having a friction fit. The atty stated that the pin electrodes did not pass through a wall of the cartridge. However, the Examiner stated that the manifold can be considered part of the filter cartridge since it is attached thereto (as shown in figure 13). It addition, it was stated that Applicant should consider the combination of Oikawa (clearly showing electrodes passing through a wall of a filter cartridge) and Clack (under 103). The examiner stated that the amendment to the claims (filed 6-2-2006) adding the word "puncturing" to claim 3 may be new matter. The atty stated he would check the translating of the original document. The examiner stated that Ackland could be used in a 103 rejection to show the obviousness of a probe puncturing a sealing material. The atty mentioned the possibility of filing a CIP to include more details in the drawings and the description about the breakpoints, sealing elements/material, and the fastening engagement. If Applicant intends to file an amendment, the Examiner suggested adding the following limitations to claim 15 (and cancelling the other independent claims) in order to advance prosecution: requiring the breakpoints to include corresponding sealing elements to sealing fit with the needle-shaped electrodes upon penetrating through the breakpoints (page 5) and adding the limitation of a peripheral annular groove 12 (page 8) adapted to receive therein the entire end of the control unit (as shown in the figure) in snapping engagement when the electrodes have been inserting into a sensing position in the filter cartridge filtrate space.